DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 574 CE 011 476

TITLE	Next Steps in Career Education.
INSTITUTION	National Advisory Council for Career Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	18 Nov 76
NOTE	39p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 017-080-01703-2, $1.60)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Education; *Change Strategies; *Educational Administration; Educational Change; *Educational Needs; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); *Policy Formation; Post Secondary Education

ABSTRACT

Six papers presented at a meeting of the National Advisory Council for Career Education, and which address the future directions of career education, are contained in this document. "Career Education: What Next?" examines the nature of the changes necessary before career education can be said to have reached its goals. In "Suggested Next Steps for Federal Initiatives in Career Education," a major research and development plan for career education at the postsecondary level is conceived. "National Institute of Education: Preliminary Fiscal Year 1978 Program Plans--Education and Work" explores education and work within the context of other NIE programs and submits the specific program plans for the Education and Work Group of NIE. "Next Steps for Career Education" analyzes conceptual designs and problems inherent in career education theory building and validation. "Next Steps in Career Education" discusses strengthening career education at the K-12 level, systematic evaluation, community resources, special program, research and development, conceptualization, and postsecondary education. "Next Steps in Career Education: Will the Opportunity for Real Reform Be Lost?" re-examines a large number of questions, particularly the relationship of career education and the liberal arts. (TA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED141574

NEXT STEPS
IN
CAREER EDUCATION

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

National Advisory Council for Career Education

November 18, 1976

CE 011 476

All the members of the National Advisory Council were involved in the process. The stimulating questioning and dialogue that emerged from the presentations resulted in the sharpening of members' ideas.

The papers belong to the authors. While they are made available by the National Advisory Council, the views and opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the position or policy of the National Advisory Council for Career Education or the United States Office of Education. No official endorsement of either the Council or the Office of Education should be inferred by the release of these papers.

Bruce Shertzer, Chairperson
National Advisory Council
for Career Education

This report is published under provisions of Public Law 93-380, Section 406 of the Education Amendments of 1974.

The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

National Advisory Council for Career Education, 1976

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1.60

Stock No. 017-080-01703-2

INTRODUCTION

Beginning at the May 1976 meeting of the National Advisory Council for Career Education, continuing in July, and concluding in September, a major portion of the agenda of each Council meeting was devoted to exploring next steps in career education. To facilitate this examination and discussion, four Council members (Larry Bailey, Charles Heatherly, Sidney Marland, Jr., and John Porter) and two ex-officio members (Kenneth B. Hoyt and Harold Hodgkinson) prepared and presented papers addressed to the future directions of career education. The ideas contained in these papers vary considerably and, for that reason, were instrumental in stimulating discussion among Council members.

Despite their variability, some common themes emerge from the papers. Six needs in career education are clearly visable. They are:

- The need for additional conceptualization and theory building
- The need for cooperation, collaboration and the use of community resources
- The need for evaluation data, particularly related to pupil achievement measures
- The need for new programmatic thrusts: comprehensiveness, solidifying current K-12 programs, extension to postsecondary education, curriculum development and infusion
- The need for additional research and development activities
- The need for consideration of special portions of the population, i.e., women, minority group members, physically and mentally handicapped, the gifted and talented.

An overview of these six papers need not be presented here. Suffice to say that:

John W. Porter, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of Michigan, *probed* into the nature of the changes which must occur in schools, in the teaching-learning process and in assessment, evaluation and reporting before it can be said that career education has reached its goals.

Sidney P. Marland, Jr., President, College Entrance Examination Board, *conceived* a major research and development plan for career education at the postsecondary level.

Harold Hodgkinson, Director of the National Institute of Education, *explored* education and work within the context of other NIE programs and submitted the specific program plans for the Education and Work Group of the NIE.

Larry J. Bailey, Professor, Occupational Education Program, Southern Illinois University, *analyzed* conceptual designs and problems inherent in career education theory building and validation.

Kenneth B. Hoyt, Director of the Office of Career Education, U.S. Office of Education, *searched* widely into many critical areas: strengthening career education at the K-12 level, systematic evaluation, community resources, special programs, research and development, conceptualization, and postsecondary education.

Charles Heatherly, Director of Education, National Federation of Independent Business, *re-examined* a large number of significant questions, particularly the relationship of career education and the liberal arts.

CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	iii
CAREER EDUCATION: WHAT NEXT? John W. Porter	1
SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS FOR FEDERAL INITIATIVES IN CAREER EDUCATION Sidney P. Marland, Jr.	7
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION: PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR 1978 PROGRAM PLANS – EDUCATION AND WORK Harold Hodgkinson	15
NEXT STEPS FOR CAREER EDUCATION Larry J. Bailey	19
NEXT STEPS FOR CAREER EDUCATION Kenneth B. Hoyt	25
NEXT STEPS IN CAREER EDUCATION: WILL THE OPPORTUNITY FOR REAL REFORM BE LOST? Charles Heatherly	33

CAREER EDUCATION: WHAT NEXT?

John W. Porter

May, 1976

Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., when he served as United States Commissioner of Education, stated in 1972 that career education was a concept whose time had arrived. This assertion was based on the fact that schools were recognized as becoming increasingly out of touch with the mainstream of American life.

As a result of that affirmation, a great deal of clamor has been generated. A careful analysis will show, however, that for the most part, it is still only clamor. The reason is not because of anything career education has or has not done. It is because career education advocates homogenizing a system which, because of these five basic problems, resists a homogenization in the name of career education:

- Formal teaching and learning tend to take place in school buildings rather than in conjunction with the community.
- Employment tends to take place away from school buildings and with little relationship to the curriculum.
- Education is seen by many as a terminal experience rather than a continuous or life-long experience.
- Except for peripheral job opportunities, youth tend not to be a highly sought after labor group, particularly in these times of double-digit inflation and high unemployment.
- Articulation between grade levels and educational agencies is not evidenced to any great extent.

If career education is to be more than a passing fancy whose time has come and gone, substantive changes in national, State, and local policies are essential to address the three problems in earnest.

The first priority will be to establish a durable National Employment Policy; a policy which when implemented would address the ethnic, racial, sex, and age problems which make welfare, poverty, crime, and disrespect rampant among the poor and have-nots in our society. *The second priority* will be to establish a long-overdue National Youth Policy; a policy which would give purpose and meaning to career education in tangible ways and which would be in accord with National Employment Policy.

In Michigan, we are concerned about these issues and, because of them, we are trying to revolutionize public education. We have used the term career education as the rubric to help us carry out that revolution. It is a revolution designed to put career education in the *Era of Essentiality* and make it a consumer-oriented part of life's activities. We take this position by chance, not design, because the U.S. Office of Education, with business, industry, labor, and the public are rallying behind the career education concept. Although we fully realize that only about half of the education community are proponents of the concept, we see it as a vehicle or label, if you will, to bring about certain critical reforms in elementary and secondary education, and possibly postsecondary education, which will result in a more consumer-oriented education. It could have been called "Real Life Education," "Education for Reality," or any number of things. The principle here is that it is not words but deeds which will make the difference. What we are attempting to do is bring about basic reforms at all levels of education, utilizing the concept of career education; thus, the definition of career education cannot be limited either to vocational preparation or to the world of work.

State education agencies traditionally have been in "cooperative collusion," or else dormant, in terms of quality schools. In Michigan, the Department of Education, therefore, has embarked upon an unprecedented approach to gauging the educational health of schools. If it is successful, the design could have far-reaching implications for all schools in the United States. Some have compared the approach to the impact of the famous Kalamazoo Decision of 1874 which resulted in local property taxes used to operate high schools.

Few school districts, if any, have been organized to undergo an educational health check on each student as he or she progresses. In reality, the schools were established to *screen*, to *sort*, and to *select* students. The normal distribution curve, the A, B, C grading system, and standardized tests were, therefore, compatible with those three basic tenets of the public schools in the United States.

During the past ten years, we have suggested that there is a need to move away from *screening, sorting,* and *selecting* and move instead toward *assisting, analyzing* and *articulating* student needs. It is incumbent upon each instructional specialist to be able to measure student achievement based on a valid and subject specific needs assessment which is sensitive to individual differences. This obviously is a different basic premise than we have operated under but, in my opinion, it could become as significant to public education as the Supreme Court Case of 1954.

Even during a time of tremendous scientific and technological growth, the focus of schools was not on technological and scientific approaches to measuring improvements in the quality and equality of the educational process. Thus, in 1976, twenty-two years after *Brown v. Topeka*, a large segment of the country still questions the principles of bussing. This is possible because the emphasis has been on projects, activities,

and process, and not on measurable results. A list of the following "code words" will illustrate this:

Early Childhood Education
Instruction Management Models
Desegregation
Self-Contained Classrooms
Learning Series
Team Teaching
Open Classrooms
Reading is Fundamental
Paperback Books
Experimental and Demonstration Programs
Academically Talented
Extended School Year Activities
Teacher Aides
Inservice Training
Bilingual Education
Multi-Cultural Education
School-Within-a-School
Metric Education
Citizenship Education
Consumer Education
Environmental Education
Global Education
Substance Abuse Prevention Education
Outdoor Education

. . . and now, Career Education.

These are the "code words" we hear most frequently. Seldom heard is what happened in school "x" as a result of ten months of instruction. We must now take these words of process and activity and translate them into a plan of action, which, in the name of quality services, produces results.

Eight specific policy changes are being proposed in order to bring about measurable and lasting change in the name of effective career education:

(1) Each school *should establish* a Neighborhood Citizen's Council which is involved realistically in the setting of goals.
(2) Each school principal in providing for staff leadership *should be responsible* for controlling the budget set aside for the school.
(3) Each staff person *should be required* to identify in advance of the start of the school year expectations for the class in the subject to be taught.
(4) Each student, for each school activity, *should be administered* a basic needs assessment to be viewed against expectations before instruction begins.
(5) Each school *should have a concrete system* for identifying students who are falling behind and a reporting system for parents prior to report card evaluations.
(6) Each school districts' report cards and evaluations to parents *should be redesigned* to relate to student expectations.
(7) Each school *should have a means for a thorough assessment of basic accomplishments* for each student at the end of the year and, when the goals are not attained, provide for extended summer schooling.
(8) Each school district *should eliminate* to the extent possible time considerations as the controlling factor in the teacher-learner process.

Changes in these eight areas would move education from the "old" method to a "new" way, utilizing new instructional models being developed. The diagram below attempts to provide for this distinction:

	The "old" method	The "new" way
Goals:	Three years of Social Studies e.g., American History Civics Economics	Student will acquire specific knowledge and experience e.g., Preparation for a changing society
Competencies:	Normative standardized testing and grades e.g., Complete courses with passing grades	Criterion tests of competency attainment e.g., Possess an understanding of the change process
Skills:	Non-specific objectives and textbook assignments e.g., Read Chapter 3 in *Problems of Democracy*	Specific performance objectives e.g., Given an event that will precipitate change, the student will identify possible and/or probable consequence of that event, as measured by minimum criteria of an objectives-referenced test

Changes in these eight areas also would place education in the mainstream of what every citizen seeks, namely, the American Dream of economic security, a good job with a stable income, a good house in a safe community, good health at reasonable costs, participation as a citizen in the democratic process and, of course, the best education possible.

I conclude by saying that career education *is* a powerful concept for bringing about fundamental change in public education. Nevertheless, it must be viewed differently from the common perception held today by most educators. Career education must be viewed as:

(1) the connector of and link among such special interest delivery systems as general education, compensatory education, vocational education, and special education,

(2) the vehicle which helps individuals recognize their own unique capabilities and then discover options for future placement, which best maximize those capabilities, and

(3) a vehicle for retraining staffs so they could utilize existing resources more effectively.

On the other hand, career education *must not be viewed* as simply a program or separate course, not merely a system put on top of an already overly bureaucratic system of texts unrelated to expectations, tests unrelated to what is being taught, and student evaluation unrelated to reality.

The projected role of the NACCE, hence, should include more in-depth involvement with career education goals and performance objectives, evaluation and assessment, professional development, and community involvement. In addition, four simple and inexpensive but fundamental steps should be taken to elevate the concept to its rightful place in the vocabulary of educational change. In summary, the *next steps* should be along this order:

(1) that schools would know that they have career education only when they can specify what is expected of students, course by course, subject by subject, and grade by grade;

(2) that schools would know that they have career education only after they begin *to assess* student needs *before* instruction and, then, to assist students in articulating what was originally identified as being reasonably expected;

(3) that schools would know that they have career education only after they have redesigned their reporting systems to relate them to what was originally expected, in terms of the effectiveness of the instructional process;

(4) that schools would know that they have career education only when, at each level, they relate to the "market place" the life role expectations which they have adopted as educational goals.

If these simple but inexpensive actions were taken in the name of career education, it would soon become evident that only one major expense, as far as the schools are concerned, would exist, i.e., re-training school personnel. Only after we have sharpened up what the schooling process can accomplish will we be able to enter into an honest-to-goodness, business, industry, labor, and education social contract for job opportunities for American youth.

SUGGESTED NEXT STEPS FOR FEDERAL INITIATIVES IN CAREER EDUCATION

Sidney P. Marland, Jr.

May 1976

Both practically and philosophically, the key to the present educational situation lies in a gradual reconstruction of school materials and methods so as to utilize various forms of occupation typifying content. . . .Only in this way can thereby on the part of the educator and of the educated a genuine discovery of personal aptitudes so that the proper choice of a specialized pursuit in later life may be indicated. Moreover, the discovery of capacity and aptitude will be a constant process as long as growth continues.

John Dewey, *Democracy and Education*
MacMillan, 1916

The work of the National Advisory Council for Career Education, up to this time, has focused largely on the elementary and secondary sector of American education. This has been a reasonable and logical delimitation. Correspondingly, Congress has given primary attention to enabling legislation at the K-12 level. It seems timely now for the National Advisory Council to address two other sectors of education as it performs its statutory function of advisement. These sectors are:

(1) Postsecondary Education
(2) Adult and Continuing Education

While much misunderstanding of career education persists in the colleges and universities, it is very clear that the education and work relationship is being addressed by many respected institutions. The following extracts from the recent writings of respected leaders in higher education are offered to make clear the assumption that *career education, perhaps under different names, is indeed now emerging as a reality in the evolution of postsecondary education's function.*

California law makes clear the universality of career education as appropriate to all levels of instruction:

> The Legislature hereby recognizes that it is the policy of the people of the State of California to provide an educational opportunity to every individual to the end that every student leaving school should be prepared to enter the world of work; that every student who graduates from any State-supported educational institution should have sufficient marketable skills for renumerative employment; and that every qualified and eligible adult citizen should be afforded an educational opportunity to become suitably employed in some remunerative field of employment.
>
> Section 7504/*The California Education Code*, 1974

Willard Wirtz and The National Manpower Institute take forceful note of the liberal arts/occupational education controversy:

> *It is imperative, then, that first priority be placed on infusing—in the truest sense—'liberal arts' and 'vocational' education.* This is what the term 'career education' implies and should be accepted as meaning. The reluctance so far to recognize this reflects the entrenchment of established bureaucracies more than any valid difference in principle.
>
> Willard Wirtz and The National Manpower Institute/*The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for Education/Work Policy*/ New Republic Book Company/Washington, D.C., 1975

The *Carnegie Quarterly* adds its voice to the call for a change in values and public policy in order to reconcile the separation of schooling and work:

> Developments over the last century have conspired to create this situation by isolating education from work. The school year and the number of years spent in school have been lengthened making 'going to school' a whole way of life and giving young people—and some educators—the impression that education prepares students only to graduate to the next level.
>
> *Carnegie Quarterly*/Spring 1975

A thoughtful and comprehensive overview of the trend in higher education is published by *The Chronicle of Higher Education*:

> The debate over the rapid development of career-oriented courses and pre-professional training at colleges and universities has intensified this academic year, as pressures for such programs increased. . . .
>
> The focus on career programs has been especially strong at small private colleges, traditionally oriented toward the liberal arts. A recent study prepared for the Association of American Colleges, an organization that has served as the voice of private higher education in the United States, said: 'As many independent institutions, especially the smaller ones having greatest enrollment problems, have developed new programs to attract students, they have tended to shift their focus toward the prevailing career orientation.' Within large universities, shifts of student interest from the 'pure humanities' to career-related programs in business administration or other areas have been widely reported. . . .
>
> Generally, institutions that have moved toward more pre-professional training and career-oriented curricula deny that they are abandoning the liberal arts for mere vocationalism. Instead, they argue, they are

trying to develop new relationships between 'occupational education' and liberal education.

The Chronicle of Higher Education February 9, 1976

Stephen Bailey, from his exceptional vantage point in the American Council of Education, offers a scholar's perspective on the dilemma:

> Most college and university education in twentieth century America has in fact been far more pre-professional or pre-career in aim and content than has been generally assumed.
>
> If this is a fair reading of where we have been in higher education, vis-a-vis career preparation, why does the widely accepted myth exist that higher education is by and large non-career oriented—indifferent to the particular needs of specific adult roles and occupations? In part, the myth exists because it has elements of reality. Most college and university curricula are designed with a general education component in mind, on the grounds that superior coping with the inner pangs and outer perversities of the human condition requires humanistic insights and cerebral skills cultivated in part through intellectual experiences that are not specific to careers. But other forces are at work to popularize the myth-model of inutile liberal arts. There is today an increasing disjunction between status hungers and employment realities in the society at large. . . .
>
> Fashioners of career curricula must catch the spirit of liberal education and meld it with vocational and professional training at all levels. That many four-year colleges do not do this job of bridging well suggests the need to have them shaken up occasionally by debates on the meaning of career education.

Stephen K. Bailey/"Career Education and Higher Education"/*Educational Record*/American Council on Education/Fall 1973

While the term *career education* may not be familiarly employed in higher education, its intrinsic and abstract presence, under any title, is evident from the foregoing passages. Yet Glenn Dumke comes squarely to the *term* itself and its meaning for higher education in California:

> Early in 1973, with the support of the Chancellor's Council of Presidents of The California State University and Colleges, I established an Advisory Committee on Career Education. The committee was charged with reviewing the current status of career education in The California State University and Colleges system and with formulating a set of recommendations on the appropriate role of various aspects of the career education concept as it affects all of higher education, but with particular application to the 19 campuses of The California State University and Colleges.
>
> Among topics which I suggested the committee explore were: (1) career education in the curriculum, (2) State and federal concern for the support of career education, (3) articulation of system efforts with career education activities in the secondary schools and the community colleges, (4) preparation of public school teachers and counselors with career education knowledge and skills, (5) cooperative education opportunities within the system, and (6) career counseling and advisement. The committee appropriately covered these topics and others they thought necessary in order to provide a complete picture of what is and should be going on within The California State University and Colleges system.

Glenn S. Dumke, Chancellor/The California State Universities/Foreword to "Career Education for the 70's and 80's: Report to the Chancellor"/September 1974

Responding to the Chancellor's charge, the California Advisory Committee addresses the curricular implications:

> In delineating curricular alternatives for career education, two categories of students must be distinguished: those majoring in occupational-professional programs and those majoring in the liberal arts disciplines. Career education has immediate, overriding implications for liberal arts students, but lesser implications for occupational-professional students. It is more likely that the latter graduates will be ready for immediate employment, having been job oriented from the beginning or at least early in their undergraduate preparation. But what of undergraduates who emerge with a general liberal arts education and who have not buttressed it with any specialized skills that might make it more attractive to prospective employers? While these students can receive counseling and be referred to a Career Planning and Placement Center, it may be too late for the counsel

and information to be of much practical value. The liberal arts major does impart some occupational awareness and competence, but there should be a more systematic way of assuring earlier exposure to career opportunities.

> "Career Education for the 70's and 80's"/Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Career Education/California State University and Colleges/September 1974

At about the same time that California was weighing its reform, the faculty of New York University was similarly engaged in declaring new institutional goals:

> We now have set priorities to which the present strengths and potential of the University can best respond:
>
> (1) Increasing New York University's academic distinction;
> (2) Strengthening career orientation for students;
> (3) Integrating University resources more effectively;
> (4) Developing a more personal environment that is both humane and efficient.
>
> These new objectives grew out of proposals made at the 1974 Goals Conference, in which over five hundred faculty, students, staff, and alumni participated, as well as a year of intensive study by the Steering Committee, over fifty commissioned papers, discussion with educational theorists, analysis of futurist literature, and consultation throughout the University. Before establishing these specific four Goals, we weighted many alternative possibilities, attempting to assess their feasibility in light of probable conditions facing the University during the coming decade. . . .
>
> While New York University takes pride in the quality of its undergraduate liberal arts and science programs and places a high priority on the values of general liberal education at all levels, we also recognize that our assets as a senior urban university equip us to be particularly useful to both undergraduate and graduate students in exploring career opportunities related to various academic disciplines. We intend to increase academic standards and capabilities and, at the same time, to strengthen the University's interaction with a wider variety of career possibilities. With a decline in opportunities for teaching positions, it is imperative that we explore many other professions for which our faculty can provide superior preparation.
>
> The meaning of this new career orientation is that the University will assume an intensified responsibility for helping students relate their academic interests to practical career opportunities and to pursuits in life that will bring personal enjoyment and fulfillment. The objective is to make high-quality education more relevant to many professions other than teaching and academic research.
>
> Goals Study Steering Committee/New York University/January 1975

Any review of current thought in higher education must take account of the extraordinary leadership of Clark Kerr. He addresses here the historic dichotomy between the standard academic divisions of the university and the once-scorned professional schools:

> . . . by many measures, these schools now have a clearer sense of their functions, a better idea of the relationship of their subject matter to that of other academic disciplines, and, for the time, at least, a stronger appeal to students than the general and disciplinary education to which they were initially appended with reluctance. Accordingly, it is suggested that, far from constituting problems for American higher education in the 1970s and 1980s, the professional schools might provide models to which universities may look for making general higher education stronger and better suited to present and future needs of students. The once 'ugly ducklings' of the academic world have now matured.
>
> Clark Kerr/Foreword to Earl F. Cheit, *The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition*/Carnegie Commission on Higher Education/McGraw-Hill 1975

This major work by Earl Cheit, cited above, examines in depth the changing values of students and society toward higher education and their ultimate influence on the meaning of higher education:

> What makes these [occupationally-oriented] fields of interest today is that they are again part of a new condition in higher education. At a time of declining enrollment growth, study related to work is growing rapidly. But this time the process is occurring under far different circumstances. For despite their early difficulties, the new professional fields have grown on their own to become highly successful professional schools. This time the situation may be much more conducive to accommodation of the liberal and the useful arts. . . .

. . .uncertainty about the relation between liberal and useful is again becoming an important concern. The reasons are clear enough. Although it was long assumed that liberal education was the paradigm of higher education, the continuing growth of higher education actually masked the fact that this assumption may not have been true for many years. Today, with growth ending, that assumption is so at variance with current experience that it no longer informs or serves as a guide. Thus, what for a long time had been a theoretical argument about the aims of education, or an academic clash between old and new fields of study, has now become a practical matter for most students, faculties, and institutions. A new vocationalism has arisen in higher education whose momentum and numbers give practical importance to Aristotle's questions, Cardinal Newman's *Discourses,* and Veblen's barbs about the encroachment of the useful on the higher knowledge. . . .

Whether motivated by idealism or the need to compromise with an idea, however, it is clear that the enrollment decisions of today's students show that professional and occupational study is what they want. President Meyerson of the University of Pennsylvania told the American Conference of Academic Deans at their annual meeting in January 1974 that in his own university. When to that majority of undergraduates who are directly in professional-degreee programs are added that majority of the remainder who in the last few years have chosen to be pre-professional students in law, medicine, management and other fields, there seem to be few left. . . .

Now colleges and universities are no longer defined by liberal education. Liberal education lacks the power to define. It lacks coherence; it lacks definition itself. Liberal education has become splintered, specialized, and, to some extent, eroded. The main evidence of this disintegration is that liberal education cannot withstand current and growing market pressures. Instead of shaping these market pressures, it now is being forced to respond to them. As the cost of education continues to mount and as college enrollments level off, State legislatures are increasingly urging that what money there is be devoted to studies where enrollment is the highest. . . .

Many liberal arts colleges have so adjusted their curricula that they are now seen by students as essentially pre-professional institutions. . . .

Many, perhaps most, institutions will find a procedure which takes account of market forces but retains a program of liberal education. Indeed, it appears many schools are now trying to shape precisely such programs. . . .They seek a program of liberal education that retains its traditional purposes, but they want to add features which are responsive to the new attitudes in higher education.

For it would seem that what many liberal arts colleges are trying to do is adopt elements of what might be called their own 'professional model.' That phrase may not commend itself to all concerned, but such staples of professional education as problem solving in the real world, credit for work experience, internships, cooperative education projects, career planning, guidance, and placement are now becoming part of the liberal arts programs.

Earl F. Cheit/*The Useful Arts and the Liberal Tradition*/Carnegie Commission on Higher Education/McGraw-Hill, 1975

While most of the foregoing citations relate principally to two- and four-year undergraduate offerings, Stephen Bailey speaks for the mid-career adult as well:

The liberal education function suggests the second contribution four-year colleges can make to career education: to work with their extension divisions and with external degree programs in providing off-campus remedial programs in liberal studies for those who have fallen into narrow vocational traps in the earlier stages of career education. If learning is to be lifelong, the liberal components of education may well be welcomed later in life when the tedium of a particular job becomes oppressive. . . .

Both graduate professional schools and graduate schools of arts and sciences have another role in relation to career education. In collaboration with university extension services, graduate schools must do more than they have done so far to provide in-service and continuing education for those who wish to shift careers, or who wish simply to keep up with changing knowledge and practice with a specific career.

Stephen K. Bailey/*op. cit.*

Dr. Bailey's observations on adult and continuing education are confirmed by the California system:

The majority of continuing education programs are designed to meet career education objectives. Most programs are designed to improve occupational and

professional abilities, thereby helping people retain their positions or upgrade themselves through advancement or change of jobs. Programs are also planned to permit initial job preparation in new occupations or professions, especially those related to existing programs. A good example is the public administration external degree program designed for both people in public administration positions and those wishing to obtain a position in this area.

The Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Career Education (California)

The foregoing array of evidence, taken by itself, would suggest that the career education concept is implanted in higher education and no useful purpose can be served by the National Advisory Council in this domain. Further, the extraordinary diversity that prevails among our postsecondary institutions, ranging from the proprietary, the two-year colleges, the technical institutes, to the four-year liberal arts institutions and the large universities and their professional schools, suggests diversity in and of itself which resolves the education and work dilemma. The student may *choose* among many options and *infuse* education and work himself from the vast repertory available. This is true, and it has been increasingly evident in student behavior in recent years. Yet the student's unexamined preoccupation with vocational outcomes dilutes and perhaps even defeats the essential liberalizing influences to which higher education must remain dedicated. This statement, then, argues not that occupational opportunities should be incorporated into the collegiate system, but that the *infusion* of occupationally-oriented teaching and learning in postsecondary education be the sustainer of the liberal arts philosophy. Stated abruptly, in the eyes of many college students today, the liberal arts needs occupational education more than occupational education needs the liberal arts. Thus, career education synthesizes liberating and utilitarian purposes.

This paper set out to address the *next steps* for the National Advisory Council for Career Education. Most of its pages have been taken up with a review of the current condition of career education in postsecondary education. The conclusions, therefore, appear to derive from the following assumptions:

(1) that the education and work relationship is now coming into place in our colleges and universities,
(2) that those postsecondary institutions are facing a time of public disenchantment,
(3) that students, including adults, increasingly expect utilitarian outcomes from their education, and
(4) that career education will be facilitated in its influence on postsecondary education by federal initiatives, including research and enabling legislation.

Drawing upon these assumptions, the National Advisory Council should consider the formulation of recommendations to the Commissioner of Education, the Director of the National Institute of Education, and the appropriate Congressional committees. As the Council views the ways in which it can address the issues affecting career education in postsecondary and adult and continuing education, it should recall the quick effectiveness of its Interim Report to Congress in November 1975. The readying of legislation affecting the K-12 sector was immediate and compatible. Accordingly, a similar report to Congress seems appropriate once we have reached consensus on the message and have undertaken the necessary external studies for the assembly of data and program objectives.

Returning to the two themes of *research* and *program implementation,* the following steps are proposed including, where feasible, the commissioning of studies:

(1) *Research*

(a) Address the recurrent and stubborn problems of manpower needs, especially as articulated with college undergraduates.
(b) Determine the state-of-the-art in broad and varied sampling of colleges and universities in order to gain insight into current levels of education and work relationships in various types of institutions, e.g., four-year liberal arts colleges, public and private universities, two-year institutions, selective colleges, open colleges, etc. [See also the 15-Week Vermont State College Counseling System.]
(c) Assess the needs of postsecondary insitutions regarding student expectations for career education.

(2) *Program Implementation*

(a) Provide initial seed money for the development of faculty in the career education mode, especially to serve the liberal arts and humanities.
(b) Develop, through facilitating legislation, models of postsecondary curriculum development in order to harmonize occupational learnings with undergraduate general education.
(c) Engage the resources of professional associations, e.g., Association of Departments of

English, Modern Language Association, The College Placement Council, and the like, in determining procedures for institutionalizing career counseling in colleges and universities.

(d) Conceptualize an uninterrupted system of permanent record of career counseling and placement functions, commencing at the middle school and continuing through college and adult education. [See the College Board materials now under field testing.]

(e) Develop the role of career counselor for colleges and universities, affording training and materials [including technologies—System of Interactive Guidance and Information (SIGI) and Computerized Vocational Information Service (CVIS)—for implementing an enlarged function in response to students' expectations as well as faculty needs.]

(f) Stimulate processes and materials for the design and administration of practical evaluation of career education by States, local districts, and postsecondary institutions. [See Association of Departments of English Bulletins, February and May, 1976; College Placement Council Report, "Four Year Liberal Arts Graduates," January 1975; "What Do Yale 'Superwomen' Find in the Job Market? Disillusionment," *New York Times*, March 25, 1976.]

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION: PRELIMINARY FISCAL YEAR 1978 PROGRAM PLANS - EDUCATION AND WORK -

[In his presentation to the National Advisory Council for Career Education on May 26, 1976, Dr. Harold Hodgkinson, Director of the National Institute of Education, provided a thorough overview of the federal investment in educational research and development, an historical review of NIE's changing priorities, and the allocation of NIE resources in the areas of the basic skills, finance and productivity, educational equity, dissemination and resources, school capacity for problem solving and, of course, education and work, the latter being defined as "improving the ability of the education system to prepare youth and adults for entering and progressing in careers." Subsequently, in July of 1976, the National Institute of Education published an Executive Summary of "Preliminary Program Plans FY 78." In terms of *next steps* the future projections of NIE, the following section deals with the program area of education and work.]

Problem Statement

Students have increasing difficulties in making the transition between school and work, and adults increasingly need to move from work to school to keep pace with their changing interests and the nature of work. In addition, sex and ethnic occupational stereotyping are limiting many from full participation in our economy and our society.

Program Purposes

- To improve understanding of the relation between education and work, both the limits of the impact of education on careers and also the extent to which education *can* influence career development throughout life; and to develop, test, and disseminate educational products and programs that can increase an individual's ability to choose, enter, and progress in work and education throughout life, without educationally fostered limitations by sex or race on career aspirations or preparation.

Highlights of 1978 Budget:

- Expand research and development needed to help increase the number of women and minorities interested in and prepared for non-traditional careers.
- Initiate studies of how to provide learning and service options to all youth who need and want alternatives to full-time school or full-time work.
- Initiate research and policy studies of adolescence to identify educational changes needed in the future to keep pace with changes in the nature of the adolescent population and its experiences.
- Continue research to find out what schools should teach to prepare for occupational mobility and transferable skills in the rapidly changing work world, and for changes in personal interests and circumstances.
- Support tests of alternate ways to assess occupational competencies, post Griggs' decisions. [Note: The decision on the relevance of educational credentials of hiring procedures.]
- Continue studies of adult educational entitlements and worker education, including studies of new brokering or linkage systems to help people move from work to school and from school to work.
- Disseminate and otherwise encourage research utilization to bring the products of career education R & D to the hands of the teachers, educational planners, and administrators who need them.

FY 1978 Program

The program is designed to meet four principal objectives. These objectives—and activities recommended to achieve the objectives—are:

A. To provide teachers, counselors, administrators, and educational planners with information and products to help expand occupational interests, choices and preparation among women and minorities.

—Specific activities include:

- Completing development of a career awareness program aimed at expanding career information and interests of children from 4th through 6th grades, particularly girls and children from ethnic minorities. The program involves parents, teachers, and the use of media.
- Supporting research and research utilization on career decision making, through grants to researchers and a center for studies of career development.
- Continuing research and other activities identify primary reasons for low interest and achievement of women and minorities in mathematics, science, and technological occupations, and developing materials or testing programs which could improve interest and preparation.
- Supporting research on problems of minority women in career development, including studies contracting the impact of educational (upward mobility programs) and non-educational (EEO requirements) approaches.
- Continuing research and development to improve measurement of the quality of career education programs and of the outcomes of career development activities.

B. To strengthen the ability of communities and States to provide learning and service experiences that keep pace with the changing nature of youth and of the transition between full-time school and full-time work.

—Specific activities include:

(1) Completing the Experience Based Career Education field testing and dissemination project jointly funded with USOE.

(2) Completing the research utilization project to expand and upgrade the supply of learning site coordinators essential for experiential learning programs.

(3) Initiation of experimental tests on how to move from "quality" to "quantity" in providing alternative learning experiences in an entire State and an urban area to serve *all* youth who need and want such experiences.

(4) Initiation of basic research on adolescent development and of a center for the study of education and youth. These studies can help take stock of the extent to which changes recommended in many reports on youth and secondary schools are taking place and with what effect, and can also assist educational planners to be more pro-active in anticipating the educational consequences of changes in the nature of the adolescent experience in the next decades.

C. To assist educational institutions, brokering institutions, and employing institutions to offer education that maximizes career preparation for occupational competencies in a manner consistent with recent court decisions such as Griggs.

–Specific activities include:

(1) Continuing research on occupational mobility and transferable skills, including testing and dissemination of prototype applications such as new college catalogs, new models of secondary school curricula, and new employee application forms.

(2) Continuing research and research utilizations on occupational certification; including an experimental test separating certification and educational functions.

D. To achieve a better understanding of how to provide greater access from work to school and from school to work, with particular emphasis on lifelong education for career development.

–Specific activities include:

(1) Completion of research and experimentation to find out why participation rates in employee tuition aid plans financed through the private sector are much lower among workers than among management, and what might increase utilization of these private sector funds.

(2) Evaluation and natural variation studies of adult entitlement programs funded through the public sector, examining who participates, for what purposes, and with what effect under different levels and conditions of eligibility.

(3) Initiation of studies on retention and completion rates in adult education for career development: why retention is apparently so low, and what changes might increase completion rates among adult learners.

(4) Studies of new transition, brokering, and linkage services: should new services be created? should present services be improved and expanded? or both? There is considerable debate on whether such functions as counseling out-of-school youth and adults, placement after completion of education, and brokering information about educational opportunities should be assumed by educational institutions, employment services and employing institutions, or new brokering groups.

Additional funds would support three activities: unsolicited proposals; expansion of the field test of alternative programs for all youth to include a suburban and a rural site; and expansion of the adult career counseling studies.

Additional information on the education and work thrust of the NIE can be obtained by writing to:

The National Institute of Education
Education and Work Group
1200 19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20208

NEXT STEPS FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Larry J. Bailey

July 1976

In June 1976, the writer completed a paper for the Illinois Office of Education entitled *Career and Vocational Education in the 1980s: Toward a Process Approach.*[1] A major purpose of the paper was to provide a primer on educational history and curriculum theory for scholars, researchers, and policy makers in career education. Implicit in the paper are a number of *next steps* for career education, the most relevant of which are summarized in the following pages. For elaboration the reader should refer to the document cited above.

(1) Reiterate a commitment to educational reform—one means by which is career education.

A survey of two hundred years of educational literature suggests that our history of education is a history of attempts to reform the school.[2] The key word is "attempts." As a social institution,[3] the school has demonstrated an amazing tendency to consistently resist change. A recent case is the experience of the Ford Foundation Comprehensive School Improvement Program.[4] After the expenditure of $30 million during the decade from 1960 to 1970, the effects resulting from the twenty-five projects funded can be characterized as negligible.

Based on knowledge of previous efforts of school reform, it would be naive to expect that career educators could achieve where so many others have failed, that is, unless—and this is my major point—career educators better understand the dynamics of change[5] and utilize systematic strategies and tested principles of change.

My personal fear is that career education will be "implemented" without education ever being "reformed." Here I am referring to the various *levels of change* which Chin[6] has delineated, levels which have profound implications for career education:

- *Substitution* - replacing one instructional element with a new one
- *Alteration* - alternate content and new methods of instruction
- *Perturbations and Variations* - temporary shifts or oscillations in a system (e.g., an externally funded career education project)
- *Restructuring* - modifying and reorganizing a system
- *Value Orientation Change* - understanding and adopting idea systems, thought models, or conceptual frameworks and assumptions which underline a new curriculum concept.

True reform (that is, the last two levels of change) means moving beyond simple infusion of career education into an existing curriculum.[7] Change at the Restructuring and Value Orientation levels involves, for example, shifts from schooling to education, from teaching to learning, from vicarious to experiential learning, from content to process objectives, from singular to pluralistic delivery systems. We career educators must not settle for too little!

(2) Differentiate between "ends" and "means."

Popham[8] maintains that "The single most important deficiency in American education is its preoccupation with (the) instructional process." He refers to the tendency in education to emphasize "means" at the expense of "ends." A brief lesson in the fundamentals of curriculum development will clarify this.

The concept of "ends" is used to refer to the learning outcomes of education: how the student changes as a result of instruction. It is synonymous with purposes, aims, goals, and objectives. "Means," on the other hand, refers to the topics, activities, materials, methods, and programs by which the "ends" are developed.

An analogy will help illustrate this distinction. Language arts is the name of a program of instruction (means) which is designed to facilitate the *process of communication.*[9] What are the learning outcomes? The language arts teacher is concerned with developing concepts and skills of reading, writing, listening, speaking, and acting out (ends). There is no other reason for the language arts program or language arts teacher to exist.

In the same way that language arts is a program of instruction designed to facilitate the process of communications, career education is the name of a program of instruction of facilitate the *process of career development.* Whereas student learning outcomes can be derived from an analysis of the construct of communications, learning outcomes can be similarly derived from an analysis of the construct of career development.[10]

Many theorists[11] have offered interpretations of learning outcomes which can be deduced from the construct of career development. This writer and a colleague[12] have suggested six categories of learning outcomes:

- Understanding and implementing self
- Understanding and preparing for work
- Accepting responsibility for career planning
- Developing skills in problem solving, decision-making, and information processing
- Relating to individuals and groups
- Developing and clarifying work attitudes and values

Suffice it to say that these categories are amendable to further description and the development of more specific performance objectives.[13]

The real significance of end-means reasoning is the matter of priority, that is, goals and objectives (ends) should always precede content and instruction (means). This requires, in planning curriculum, that objectives should be identified *prior* to selecting the topic, activity, and materials to be used in facilitating the objective. As simple as this basic principle is, it is almost always violated in practice. The so-called *infusion* approach to career education is a classic example.

In this approach, teachers utilize topics, activities and materials drawn from the world of work to *infuse* the conventional subject areas of math, science, language arts and social studies. For example, I have observed a third grade classroom in which children were reading books about occupations. I was told that this was "career education." I then asked what the learning outcome was for the instruction. After considerable thought, the teacher acknowledge that the objective (end) was to develop *reading skills*. This is obviously an important learning outcome. I maintain, however, that it is not "career education" anymore than reading about dinosaurs is "dinosaur education." The ends of instruction, not the means, determine whether or not a given activity is career education.

What does this imply in terms of *next steps*? I propose that there are two different, albeit legitimate, roles for career education. The first, which I would designate as the *primary role*, is to facilitate career development. This involves identifying the types of career development learning outcomes discussed above. Curriculum can then be developed or selected to facilitate such objectives. Many theorists are actively involved in formulating curriculum models of this type.

The role which I would designate as the *secondary role* for career education involves using topics, activities and materials from the world of work to make academic subject matter more relevant and concrete (for example, using occupational information to teach reading). It goes without saying that one can be successful in teaching reading through occupational information without ever assisting a student to make a personally meaningful educational or occupational decision.

The issue raised here is much more than a simple matter of semantics. Facilitating career development learning outcomes and employing infusion techniques are both important. Their relationship, however, is not one of equal importance. The former usage is what career education *should* be all about. The latter usage, as important as it may be, is what John Dewey called "good teaching."

(3) Assume a more active leadership role toward achieving consensus on a redefinition of educational purpose.

In many ways it is unfortunate that so much time and energy has been spent in discussions about the differences between academic and career education and between vocational and career education. Such discussion has taken place at the expense of discussions about how career education is compatible with many present and emerging concepts of education.

An important feature of this writer's recent paper[14] is the identification of a large number of new conceptions which share a great deal in common with career education. Among the conceptions being proposed are the following:

> affective. . . humanistic. . . psychological. . . alternative. . . moral. . . affirmative. . . confluent. . . futuristic. . . personalized. . . process. . . self-actualizing. . . life-centered. . . survival. . . future-focused. . . self-science. . . aesthetic. . . self-guiding. . . liberating.

All of these are derived in large part from a humanistic theory of education[15] which views purposes in terms of learner's needs in the reality of both the present and the future. Such a position is significantly different from the traditional content-based and information-dispensing view epitomized in present practice. (See again Popham's quotation above.)

The eighteen concepts just listed collectively represent an evolutionary trend which is too large, and too important, to be ignored. The foundations are truly at hand for formulating a redefinition of educational purpose which includes career development as one of its major aims. Career educators should take an active role in initiating dialogues among the theorists and practitioners whose views are compatible with career education. We have been tilting at windmills for far too long.

(4) Continue theory-building and validation along with implementation.

It is common knowledge that in education there are many different theories of learning, teaching, evaluation, and curriculum. It is not so commonly known, however, that there are many different theories of career education. This is unfortunate. In the Fall 1975 issue of the *Journal of Career Education*[16] no less than eight different approaches to or theories of career education were discussed. And there are many other additional examples in the literature of career education.

Might it not be a good idea to bring all of these theorists together in a forum to exchange ideas and learn

from one another? There is need as well for career education theorists to exchange ideas with other social-behavioral scientists of the type referred to in the above item. Shall we also consider a conference involving critics—e.g., W. Norton Grubb, and Marvin Lazerson—as well as advocates? [The reference here is to Grubb and Lazerson's article critical of career education in the *Harvard Educational Review*, November 1975.]

The point is, that as we move toward *next steps* in career education (such as a postsecondary thrust) we must not neglect basic conceptualization and theory building. The writer firmly believes that a majority of our career education funds *ought to be* devoted to implementation and evaluation. He only wishes to emphasize that the development of theory is an important activity which should receive modest attention—by means of funding. A considerable number of person-years of research and development will be required to develop conceptual models for career education which can stand the test of accountability.

(5) The National Advisory Council for Career Education should take stands on public issues effecting career education.

The previous steps were broad and general recommendations. The final point is limited specifically to the role of the National Advisory Council for Career Education (NACCE).

Commissions, committees, and councils such as the NACCE have the potential for providing important leadership in educational policy-making. An appropriate example is the sixth report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education which dealt with guidance and counseling.[17] The discussion—written and oral—which resulted from this controversial statement ultimately strengthened the guidance and counseling field. The vocational education Advisory Council in this instance demonstrated awareness of what its role could be. It focused on an issue which others were unable or unwilling to address.

There are presently a number of conditions which threaten to thwart career education during its formative period. Two examples come to mind. The first is the declining nature of the educational enterprise, both in terms of public school enrollment and levels of funding. As local school boards continue to be faced by budget deficits, there is little interest or willingness to consider adding such new concepts as career education.

A second example of a condition which begs for enlightened leadership is the effects of the "back to basics" movement in many parts of the country. The movement is very often associated with the first example, the decline in enrollment and funding. This is not to say that a "back to basics" movement is not justified. In many cases it is. The concern is that in many school districts career education will never get a chance to demonstrate its validity because conditions unrelated to the merits of the concept are dominating the attention of local officials. In times of financial exigency, most elementary school teachers (for example) interested in career education are powerless to make a case for career education. The National Advisory Council, however, does have the expertise and resources to focus on such an issue.

An important decision for the Advisory Council relates to the role or roles it chooses to exercise. What the Council must guard against, in the judgment of this writer, is trying to be all things to all people. It ought not, for example, attempt to conduct a Research and Development program or duplicate functions which the National Institute of Education, Office of Career Education, or other agencies are doing. There are no other groups in career education such as the National Advisory Council which has the legislative mandate, and the responsibility, to recommend policy. The Council should be sensitive to this fact and act accordingly.

Notes and References

1. Bailey, L. J. *Career and Vocational Education in the 1980s: Toward a Process Approach.* Final Project Report RDC-A6-244, Illinois Office of Education, June 15, 1976 A.
2. *Ibid.* Chapter Two, "The Historical Pursuit of Purpose for American Education." In Bailey 1976A, pp. 4-20.
3. For a discussion of the "functions" and "conventions" of the school as an institution see N. Postman and C. Weingartner's, *The School Book: For People Who Want to Know What All the Hollering is About.* New York: Delacorte Press, 1973.
4. A Foundation Goes to School: *The Ford Foundation School Improvement Program.* New York: The Foundation, 1972.
5. A representative example of the available literature on educational change is John Goodlad's *The Dynamics of Educational Change: Toward Responsive Schools.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
6. Chin, R. "Some Ideas on Changing." In Richard I. Miller (ed.), *Perspectives on Educational Change.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
7. In fact, the existing curriculum itself should be the target for a bulk of reform efforts.
8. Popham, W. J. "Focus on Outcomes: A Guiding Theme of ES '70 Schools." *Phi Delta Kappa,* 1969, 51(4), 208-210.
9. This definition of "communications as a process" is the basis for James Moffett's *Interaction* language arts and reading program produced by Houghton Mifflin.
10. Donald Super is foremost among those who advocate facilitating career development as the purpose of career education. For example, Super states: "When the concepts of career development are more widely understood, and

when its methods and materials are more visible, career education will have come of age." (Super, D. E. "Career Education and the Meaning of Work." Paper prepared for the Office of Career Education, First Draft, June 10, 1975, p. 46).

11. See Chapter I, "Career Education: Theory and Rationale" in Bailey, L. J. *Facilitating Career Development: An Annotated Bibliography, II.* Final Project Report No. V3610056, Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation, February 1974, pp. 1-25.
12. Bailey, L. J. and Stadt, R. W. *Career Education: New Approaches to Human Development.* Bloomington, Illinois: McKnight, 1973.
13. For example, see Chapter III, "Career Education, Grades K-6: Purpose, Goals, and Activities" in Bailey, L. J. *A Teacher's Handbook on Career Development for Children with Special Needs: Grades K-6.* Illinois Office of Education, 1976 B, pp. 27-52.
14. Appendix A, "Foundations for a Redefinition of Education Purpose: A Quotation Bibliography." In Bailey 1976 A, pp. 82-145.
15. For a discussion of the humanistic theory of education see R. E. Mason's *Contemporary Educational Theory.* New York: David McKay, 1972.
16. "Focus on Vocationalism and Humanism in Career Education." *Journal of Career Education,* 1975, 2 (2).
17. "Counseling and Guidance: A Call for Change." Sixth Report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1972.

NEXT STEPS FOR CAREER EDUCATION

Kenneth B. Hoyt

July 1976

Introduction

Career education is an evolutionary, rather than a revolutionary, approach to educational reform. This must be true for a variety of reasons including: (a) attitudinal change does not come quickly or easily – and that, basically, is where implementation of the career education concept must start: (b) as a developmental concept, career education asks for changes in the entire system of Education, not just in one part or at one level; and (c) the kinds of changes being sought, since they operate neither from a single organized segment of Education nor with the use of large amounts of money, are strange to many educators and, as a result, difficult to understand.

Thus, when one speaks of "next steps" for career education, the steps taken must be very small indeed. Career education's current problems stem relatively more from the fact that we have tried to do too much too rapidly than from the fact that, in some areas, we have done too little too slowly. Any new movement in Education requires a large surge to get started – and career education, thanks to Sidney P. Marland, Jr., had such a surge. It seems to me advisable to solidify the position we have now reached before embarking on another big surge. By this, I certainly don't mean we shouldn't be sending out "scouting parties" in new areas nor that we should be unwilling to help, in all possible ways, those who now express interest in joining with us. Certainly, I believe we should begin to move much more actively into postsecondary education with the career education concept. At the same time, it seems to me our major efforts must be directed toward solidifying and strengthening the implementation of career education at the elementary and secondary school levels.

In keeping with this view, these remarks are divided into three parts. First, some comments will be directed toward solidifying the career education concept at the elementary and secondary school levels. Second, the major conceptual concerns that affect career education at all levels of Education will be discussed in terms of next steps. Finally, brief remarks will be directed toward career education efforts at the postsecondary level.

Next Steps At The Elementary and Secondary School Levels

Great strides have been made over the last five years, at the elementary school level, to both "invent" and to implement career education at the building level. Significant, but far less, progress has also been made at the junior and senior high school levels. I am convinced that this is true, in spite of some apparent contradictory data found in the recently completed AIR study. Much more remains to be done at these levels before we can claim that career education is, in fact, serving as an effective vehicle of educational reform. Here, I would like to identify what, in my opinion, are the major operational problems demanding our immediate and urgent attention.

1. *Improving Comprehensiveness Of The Career Education Effort.* The AIR data provided estimates that, while approximately 9,000 of the nation's K-12 public school systems have initiated some kind of career education activity, what AIR identified as "comprehensive" efforts were taking place in only about 3% of our public school districts. When one realizes that what AIR described as "comprehensive" was really far from what we would like to see, the seriousness of the problem becomes even more apparent.

In practice, we find few school systems where the career education concept has been effectively implemented at the building level, let alone throughout the system. Instead, we find isolated teachers – the innovative, creative, unafraid "self-starters" bravely pursuing career education efforts in their classrooms. Even "self-starters" will eventually lose their enthusiasm unless their enthusiasm and commitment is, in some way, reinforced. I have a feeling that we have come about as far as possible by depending on "self-starters." It is now time that systematic attempts be made to enlist the understanding and commitment of the vast majority of elementary and secondary educators to career education. To accomplish this, I am convinced that there is an immediate and critical need to concentrate attention now on gaining understanding of and support for career education on the part of school administrators and school board members.

To initiate a comprehensive career education effort will demand that money be available to purchase the time required for the kinds of "people change" career education seeks. The fact that the amount of money required is relatively small does not mean that it is not crucial. It is not simply a question of providing money where none previously existed. Rather, it is a question of replacing the previously, but no longer, available vocational education funds and supplementing those funds with additional dollars. Whether the source of these dollars is local, State, or Federal funds is not nearly as important as is the availability of some funds. Even more important, current conditions preclude the addition of new kinds of dollar support and, instead, demand that we spend currently available dollars in a different fashion. This fact, more than any other, leads me to believe that a significant "next step" must be directed

27

toward school administrators and school board members.

Without a concentrated drive toward increasing the comprehensiveness of delivery of career education, efforts to evaluate the success of our efforts carry a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure. The evaluation of effectiveness of a treatment demand that the treatment really is applied. This, it seems to me, must be our first concern.

2. *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Career Education.* Wherever comprehensive career education efforts now exist, there is a critical current need to engage in systematic evaluation of their effectiveness. Two factors have delayed this effort to date. First, many have pointed out that, because it is a developmental concept, the truly important long run effects of career education cannot be known for at least another 20 to 30 years. Second, much attention has been devoted to our lack of suitable instrumentation, in such domains as teacher/student attitudes, work values, decision-making, and self concept, that is currently hindering our efforts aimed at short-term evaluation of career education's effectiveness. I am convinced that, while both points are valid and important, neither can be allowed to serve as an excuse for failing to greatly increase our attempts to evaluate current comprehensive career education efforts wherever they can be found.

As a vehicle for reform of *Education*, career education should not be afraid to use traditional evaluative criteria – including increases in pupil achievement, in pupil attendance, and in school holding power. Of these, demonstrations of the ability of a career education approach to increase pupil achievement in the basic academic skills is, by far, the most crucial. While preliminary evidence available suggests that career education can have such an effect, this evidence is, at present, far too sparse and too susceptible to criticism for us to claim that career education, if properly applied, *will* produce such results. With the current strong national push toward a "back to basics" emphasis, it seems to me especially crucial that comprehensive career education efforts demonstrate that, in fact, they can serve as an effective vehicle for improving basic academic achievement. I am not afraid to use this criterion providing that a truly comprehensive career education effort is being applied. I am very fearful of using it with some of the efforts now being called "career education" that exist in many schools.

3. *Increasing Effectiveness Of Use Of Community Resources.* Career education, from the outset, has pictured itself as a collaborative effort involving the formal education system with both the business/labor/industry community and with the home/family structure. While positive and significant beginnings have been made in implementing this portion of the career education concept, much remains to be done which certainly qualifies as "next steps" for career education.

One area requiring immediate attention is that of encouraging the initiation of local efforts aimed at implementing national policies of a variety of forces from the business/labor/industry community – and then coordinating such efforts in ways that increase the effectiveness of the career education effort. Current national programs directly linked to the career education effort exist in great numbers. They include those of such organizations as: (a) Chamber of Commerce; (b) Rotary International; (c) American Legion; (d) Exploring Program of the Boy Scouts of America; (e) Girl Scouts of the USA; (f) National Council of Churches; (g) National Alliance of Businessmen; and (h) Junior Achievement. Individual corporations and major labor unions have also launched national efforts aimed at career education goals and objectives – including: (a) General Motors Corporation; (b) General Electric Company; (c) American Telephone & Telegraph Company; (d) United Autoworkers; (e) United Rubber, Plastic, and Linoleum Workers; and (f) American Cyanimid Corporation. Each of these efforts is commendable and deserving of full and enthusiastic support on the part of all concerned about career education.

Most of the national organizations mentioned have State and local chapters of some kind. They could, and should, be fantastically valuable resources for use in the implementation of career education. Three major "next step" problems currently face us here: (1) These national efforts have not, by and large, trickled down to the local level in ways that will allow local persons to recognize the need and their potential for contributing positively to the career education effort. Like those of us in USOE, the rhetoric at the national level far exceeds the action at the local level; (2) The various national programs, while having much in common, also have some differences. Further, each has been pictured as an effort independent of all the others. If and when the national effort reaches the local level, there will be tremendous problems of coordinating such efforts in ways that ensure that each complements and supplements, rather than competes, with the others. Since all impact on the schools, the education system will undoubtedly be faced with this task of coordination; and (3) these national efforts must not be allowed to preclude the critical importance and necessity for career education practitioners to work effectively, in a "1 on 1"

basis, with small independent business establishments whose involvement will be crucial to successful implementation of a comprehensive career education effort.

In the home/family area, career education efforts, to date, have been largely limited to the use of parents as resource persons for career education activities both within and outside the classroom. We have yet to begin a truly comprehensive and major effort to include the home/family structure itself in the implementation of the career education concept. While, perhaps, it could be argued that some further delay in this area may be necessary, I am convinced that it cannot wait much longer. If it does not qualify as a "next step" now, it soon will.

4. *Labor Unions, Low Income Persons, and Career Education.* Organized labor has resisted career education, in part, because of a fear that work experience efforts of career education might result in such dangers as ignoring minimum wage laws and taking jobs away from employed adults. Career education has responded by emphasizing the positive career exploration values associated with unpaid work experience. Unpaid work experience appeals very little to poor people – they already know what it's like *not* to have money. If career education is to appeal to low income persons, there is a need to emphasize paid work experience for such persons. If career education is to fulfill its promises, it must appeal to both organized labor and to low income persons. This is a dilemma which can no longer be ignored as we proceed toward "next steps" in implementing the career education concept.

The only way I know that this dilemma can be solved is through the active involvement of career education conceptualizers, labor union leaders, and representatives of low income persons in a problem solving mode. Expertise required to solve this problem obviously does not exist among the conceptualizers of career education or it would have already been solved. Involvement of both organized labor and low income persons is essential. It would seem to me that this must be a high priority "next step" for career education.

5. *Improving effectiveness of career education for special portions of the population.* Current, and past, efforts of the Office of Career Education to support demonstration efforts aimed at meeting the career education needs of such persons as women, minority group members, the physically and mentally handicapped, and gifted/talented individuals have been consistently applied but not at a high level of dollar expenditure. This, in no way, reflects a lack of either interest or concern. Rather, it stems strictly from the way our current career education legislation is written. The AIR data incidate that considerable progress has been made, in all of these areas, by those seeking to implement career education. Yet, much remains to be done.

There is no apparent way in which we, in the Office of Career Education, can do more with the funds now available to us. It seems to me that a significant, and much needed, "next step" for career education must be aimed at seeking the collaborative involvement of the major national organizations involved in implementing career education for these special, and obviously important, persons. The "mini-conferences" we have held involving representatives of such groups have given us a greater understanding of the problems involved. They have not resulted in gaining any high degree of visible support from key national groups aimed at ensuring the effective delivery of career education for members of these special populations. We should not, and must not, stop here.

6. *Increasing the R & D Effort In Career Education.* While R & D functions cannot legally be carried out now by OE's Office of Career Education, they can and are being conducted by our counterparts within NIE. Such efforts certainly need to be continued and increased both in variety and intensity. It would be inappropriate here for me to try to specify, with any level of exactness, the specific directions such efforts should take. That is, we in OCE do not dictate to NIE any more than they dictate to us. Suffice it to say here that we recognize and support the need for continuing high NIE priority on R & D functions related to career education. It is very much a need "next step."

Next Steps In Conceptualization of Career Education

As an evolving concept, the meaning of the term "career education" has undergone considerable change during the five years since Sidney Marland, Jr., first used it as Commissioner of Education in USOE. It will undoubtedly continue to do so. As the concept matures, it seems inevitable that it will be put into broader perspective. Since no one can pretend to accurately portray the future, the "next steps" listed here are more correctly thought of as representing my personal hopes and aspirations. While I will hopefully continue to change my mind as I learn more, the following represent conceptual "next steps" that, at present, I intend to fight for no matter where I may be employed:

1. *Retention of the word "work" as the bedrock of the career education concept.* I feel very comfortable with our current OE definition of "work" that emphasizes the human need of all human beings to do – to

accomplish – to achieve. It is a need which Education should have always been consciously striving to meet. It will continue to be so. Our current definition, it seems to me, is one that will be germane for so long as we can see into the future in terms of predicted societal changes. It is finite enough in meaning so that we can: (a) say with some exactness what we are trying to emphasize without (b) pretending to make the term "career education" synonymous with "education" itself.

2. *Clarifying and emphasizing the CHANGING relationships between Education and work.* The goal of "education as preparation for work" cannot continue to be viewed as limited in scope to providing persons with specific vocational skills that can be used by youth to enter the world of paid employment. It seems to me that we will have to continue and increase our emphasis on broadening the meaning of this goal in ways that will allow the following *additions* to (note: *not* substitutes for) this earlier meaning: (a) an emphasis on adaptability skills that will allow people to change with changes in the occupational society; (b) an emphasis on education/work relationships as ones covering almost the entire life span rather than ones to be viewed in a sequential pattern; (c) an emphasis on work performed as part of productive use of one's leisure time; (d) an emphasis on changing meanings of and divisions of work within the context of changing home/family relationships; and (e) an increased emphasis on reduction of both sexism and racism as deterrents to full freedom of work (note: not just "occupational") choices. Too many persons have failed to recognize the need for career education in terms of the ways in which education/work relationships have, and will continue to have been, *changed.*

3. *Emphasizing the multiple basic goals of American Education.* As the career education concept matures, it seems to me it should result in a resurgence of the need for purpose and purposefulness – of meaning and meaningfulness – on the part of all who teach and all who learn. It may well be that this emphasis will represent an even greater contribution to change in American education that can be seen only with our emphasis on education/work relationships as a basic reason for teaching and learning. At the same time, we must continue to place our primary emphasis on the need to bring a *proper* emphasis to our one goal – i.e., education as preparation for work – *among* the several basic goals of education or it will, once again, get "lost in the shuffle."

4. *Emphasizing educational reform through application of a concept.* I believe career education will continue to operate as a reform movement in education through operating as a concept to be applied to all educational programs rather than as a new kind of program to be added to all those currently in existence. That is, we must continue to emphasize the need for "people change" rather than for "program add-ons." This is the only way reform can truly come about. We must continue to strive to make education more cost effective, *not* to make education cost more dollars. We want an increase in educational *effort,* but not in educational *budgets.* It means that we must plan to continue to operate with the power of persuasion, not with the power of position that comes with large budgets and large staffs. Unless we continue in this direction, *reform* of the education system cannot and will not come about.

5. *Continued evolvement as a national, rather than as a Federal, effort.* It is, I think, essential that we count on the continuing evolving of the career education concept as a national, rather than as a Federal effort. That is, the prime emphasis must continue to be on local actions most, on State actions next, and on Federal actions least. The prime reason for this emphasis is found in what now appears to be an absolute necessity for viewing career education as a collaborative effort involving school/community interaction – with change coming about both among educators and among a wide variety of community members. To date, it seems to me we have emphasized the need for internal changes in educators more than we have for internal changes among members of the business/labor/industry community and the home/family structure. This cannot continue if career education is to be successfully implemented. Because of wide variation in community structure and values, it seems imperative that career education continue to evolve primarily as a local effort.

6. *Emphasizing a commonality of purpose along with diversity of teaching/learning opportunities.* As the career education concept continues to evolve, I believe it will do so by simultaneously emphasizing both the commonality of purpose which the goal of "education as preparation for work" holds among almost all educational programs along with at least an equal emphasis on diversity of delivery methods employed in the teaching/learning process. It may well be that an important part of the evolving career education concept will be seen in its emphasis on encouraging variety in both the sequence of learning opportunities and the methodology of teaching. A continuing emphasis on career education as a vehicle for encouraging such diversity among all educational programs seems likely, but the value of

variety itself may well prove to be a significant next step in career education's conceptual efforts.

These, then, are what seem to me likely next steps in the evolving career education concept. By considering what I have said here in a different light, it will be obvious as to what directions I hope career education will *not* take as the concept evolves further.

Career Education and Post-Secondary Education

There is no doubt that, if the promise of career education is to be realized, the concept must be extended to all of post-secondary education. Further, I have no doubt that receptivity to the career education concept is probably already stronger in postsecondary education than most persons today seem to recognize or acknowledge. Finally, I have no doubt that implementation of career education, at the postsecondary level, will be both slower and more difficult than at the K-12 levels of education. Extension to postsecondary education will, to be sure, be an essential "next step," but it will not be one that will come about easily or rapidly in my opinion. There are four basic obstacles to be overcome here.

First, we should recognize that, in the history of American education, concepts of educational reform have been applied much more frequently at the K-12 than at the postsecondary education level. Persons in higher education have spent much more time urging reform on others than on advocating reforms for themselves. Where reform has occurred in postsecondary education, it has typically taken the form of "add-on" emphasis in either types of educational institutions or programs within institutions, *not* in basic changes within educational personnel employed at a particular institution. Establishment of land grant colleges beginning in the last part of the 19th century emphasized a new *kind* in institution, not basic changes in those currently existing. Emergence of the community college movement, too, has resulted in a different form of postsecondary education, but not in a call for basic change within the total framework of postsecondary education. Within traditional institutions of higher education, we see today emergence of a wide variety of new kinds of educational programs and educational delivery systems. We do not see great change in the basic institutional structure. The kinds of changes posed by career education would affect most parts of the entire campus. This will not be easily accomplished.

Second, those changes that have come to postsecondary education, over the years, appear to me to be primarily as a result of infusion of large amounts of new dollars that caused institutional re-direction. If the career education concept is to be applied to postsecondary education, it cannot, of course, be done through this method – or the concept itself would be destroyed. I have an unverified feeling that this approach to educational change may have difficulty gaining rapid acceptance among those who work in postsecondary education.

Third, the current tendency of postsecondary education to respond to a call for an increased emphasis on education/work relationships has been one of increasing emphasis on professional specialization programs along with a relative de-emphasis on the liberal arts. This has resulted in a variety of philosophical arguments regarding what is popularly described as "liberal arts vs. career oriented education." To those of us in career education, of course, this is a specious argument and one that would not exist if people fully understood the career education concept. In spite of this, such arguments have been raised and, as a result, resistance to career education efforts has been heightened on many campuses. This resistance may be difficult to overcome.

Finally, my biggest worry about efforts to introduce and to implement the career education concept in postsecondary education stems from the primary importance career education places on internal changes within members of the teaching faculty leading to a variety of changes in the teaching/learning process. Having been a university faculty member since 1950, I believe I know what I am talking about when I say the necessity for this kind of change poses a set of very formidable challenges. I fear that it will be difficult to convince many faculty members in postsecondary education to read even the basic literature in career education as a basis for deciding whether or not they wish to change. Most, I believe, feel that they scarcely have time to keep up with the literature in their own professional specialty, let alone read literature from another field. To suggest the need for meaning and meaningfulness to come from more than the substantive content itself is sure to be insulting to many faculty members. Yet, unless change comes about in terms of both the attitudes and in the actions of individual faculty members, implementation of the career education concept in postsecondary education will not be fully achieved. I see no way this problem can be avoided or regarded as unimportant.

Let me again emphasize that I do not believe implementation of the career education concept in postsecondary education will be impossible. I do believe it will be relatively more difficult and time-consuming than at the K-12 levels.

Concluding Remarks

Whenever one speaks of "next steps," there is an inherent implication that we must do better than we are doing at present. As a result, a discussion of "next steps" almost inevitably leads one to look at present efforts with less than complete enthusiasm. I recognize and acknowledge that I have been guilty of that in this presentation.

Because of this, I feel a strong need to conclude this presentation in a more optimistic fashion. Personally, I am neither disappointed nor ashamed about progress that, to date, has been made in developing and implementing the career education concept. Never has a concept evolved so quickly with so much enthusiasm in so many parts of the country and among such a wide variety of audiences with so few dollars.

The concept is strong and getting stronger. Career education has done more than many previous efforts in that it has gone beyond simply identifying problems and has moved actively toward beginning to solve them. It has done so with a minimum of dollars and a maximum of professional commitment to change. It has not called for a vast series of costly, time-consuming new programmatic efforts but, instead, has operated on a philosophy that asks us to discover the very best we can do with the total community resources now available to us before asking for any new large financial resources. As we recognize th obvious fact that must more remains to be done, let us also recognize that we have already accomplished a very great deal under what, at best, have been very difficult conditions. I am very, very proud and appreciative of those who have worked and who continue to work in the career education crusade. I remain very confident and optimistic regarding the future of career education.

NEXT STEPS IN CAREER EDUCATION: WILL THE OPPORTUNITY FOR REAL REFORM BE LOST?

Charles Heatherly

September 1976

I feel greatly honored to be asked to present a paper on career education and not a little presumptuous in accepting the assignment. I joined the National Advisory Council for Career Education out of a sense of personal dedication to the career education movement and the desire to further strengthen the bonds of mutual support between education and the business sector. As education director for the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), I developed some familiarity with the elements of career education through close cooperation with the Career Education Pilot Project of the Institute for Public Affair's Research organization in Portland, Oregon. The National Federation is also intimately involved with several vocational programs, including the Distributive Education Clubs of America and Future Business Leaders of America programs as well as Junior Achievement. I did not join the Council, however, posing as an expert on all aspects of career education but rather as a citizen, parent, quasi-educator, and business representative who shares a deep concern for the future progress of career education and a willingness to participate in efforts to direct that movement toward the realization of its dynamic potential.

It is in the capacity of a concerned citizen rather than a professional educator or social scientist that I dare to venture into these dangerous waters. I am certain that my presentation will be taken in that light by the readers, both experts and laymen. And since my participation on the Advisory Council is essentially as a private citizen, it should be understood that the views expressed do not necessarily represent the policies or viewpoints of the NFIB or, least of all, the business community as a whole.

The title of the paper reflects my uneasiness over the direction the career education movement might take in the months ahead. The uneasiness flows not from any particular event or policy development but basically from the pervasive ambiguities and compromises which afflict the movement at all levels. Maybe this is inescapable in a reform movement of this type and maybe the ambiguities are but shadows of sharper definitions on the horizon. Yet, at times it seems the movement is as much a coalition of reform agents as it is a unified movement with its own philosophy. Obviously there are and must be a tremendous diversity of concepts in any reform movement, many interest groups approaching the subject from different perspectives, and many more issues debated and analyzed than are ever resolved with finality. But unless the varied interests share a common vision of educational alternatives and unless they can forge public consensus and support necessary to institute those alternatives, the goals of reform so ably articulated by a few spokesmen will achieve only a respectful place in the encyclopedia of lost causes. On the other hand, we should acknowledge that most reform movements fall somewhere between success and failure. They often alter institutions without transforming them. In most cases this is all to the good. Given the massive inertia of educational bureaucracies, we can hope for little else in the case of career education.

I have spoken of career education as a "movement" rather than as a philosophy or program because it seems to be an expression of a broadly-based coalition of interests—parents, business and labor, educators, and even theorists—rather than a program espoused by any one segment or contemporary idealogy. It appears to be more broadly based and more genuinely spontaneous and pragmatic than other reformist eruptions of recent years. Its strength—thus far, at least—grows from its power to speak to the varied yet consonant concerns of these diverse groups. Its future may depend upon its ability to maintain the coherence of its programmatic thrust while holding in check the strong centifugal forces at its core.

In plain English, the question is: Will the career education movement achieve any of its major reformist goals before the partners in this coalition break into quarreling factions? This is far from being a rhetorical question, as anyone who has witnessed the delicate negotiations over terminology in the recent Vocational Education amendments legislation can attest. The proposition, for example, that career education "is a reform, not another add-on" has yet to be fully implemented anywhere in our educational system and, least of all, at United States Office of Education where it is consistently and, no doubt, sincerely advocated.

It would be highly presumptuous—and more importantly, futile—for me to attempt any significant conceptual breakthroughs in the understanding of career education philosophy, rationale, or techniques. It would be next to impossible to improve on the definition articulated by Dr. Kenneth Hoyt in the U.S. Office of Education policy statement, *An Introduction to Career Education* (1975). His definition has a clarity and comprehensiveness rare in educational theorists and rarer still in federal government publications. By focusing the definition on the centrality of the concept of *work*, Hoyt recognized the need for limiting the scope of career education while encompassing enough territory to render both possible and meaningful the governance of this new domain. I stress "possible" because some things are excluded and "meaningful", because so many important things are included. *Work* is defined with the precision and purpose of a surgeon: "A conscious effort. . .aimed at producing socially acceptable benefits for oneself and others." Most of us are familiar with this definition.

There is no need to belabor it. I do want, however, to acknowledge explicitly Hoyt's perspective as the cornerstone of my modest edifice even though my other concerns may differ from his.

If I have anything to add to this "evolving concept," as Hoyt calls it, it is merely to call for a constant re-emphasis of the difference between vocational and career education, differences acknowledged in all the official writings but nonetheless ignored in practice, especially in State and local programs. For this reason it might be worthwhile to call attention to the illuminating essay on the definition of career education by Dr. Robert J. Rossi which appeared in the preliminary draft of the American Institutes for Research (AIR) 1974-75 national survey on career education. [It is unfortunate that the essay was not included in the final document.] Rossi employed the tools of linguistic analysis to build a coherent and useful definition which is true both to our need to differentiate between vocational and career education, on one hand, and to our experience in education as a whole on the other. The following is a brief passage from the essay:

> . . .the making of a career decision. . .becomes the crucial aspect of an individual's ability to transform *labor* into *work* and to become the person he wants to be as a result of working. 'Career' refers, in this sense, to one's projections of what one will be as a result of the activities in which one engages. The 'world of work' can thus be interpreted *not only* as a socially predefined world one enters, but also as a world one creates through the process of self-definition and self-actualization. (Emphases in original)

Rossi's definitions of education, career, and work are entirely consistent with and complementary to Hoyt's. They serve to emphasize the crucial elements of *choice* and *planning* which distinguish career education from vocational training or occupational role-playing. We must keep these distinctions constantly in mind when explaining or defending career education to friends, foes, and colleagues. This *deliberative* core of career education is easily ignored and even misunderstood by some career education partisans who rush to harvest the fruits of "neo-vocationalism" only to discover this hybrid upstart has contaminated the markets for traditional products. Some vocationalists react with alarm when the implications of *serious* career education/career development programming become apparent. Most vocational education leaders, however, have welcomed the "newcomer on the block" as a friend and partner even while recognizing that the rules of the game have changed.

Although the tensions and differences with the vocational education realm are real enough, it is with the liberal arts fiefdoms that career education will have to fight its most decisive battles. I use the medieval metaphor advisedly because the realm of higher education wherein this animal reigns really is a relic of medieval times. The federal government may be the new King John, but the power of local barons is still considerable. Like the mediavel barons, the power of the modern liberal arts deans rests on a potent mixture of tradition, obscurantism, and sheer coercion (in the form of budgets). I could extend the metaphor and point out that medieval kingdoms were also non-profit institutions, hostile to innovation, and wholly dependent on the benevolence of nature and of Divine Providence, the deity of the 20th Century being the Ford Foundation and other lesser gods known to inhabit the caverns of the Fortune 500.

The hostility of liberal arts schools to career education springs from two sources. Much of it is simply misperception of career education as vocational education in drag: seductive but impotent. As such career education can be dismissed with a quick once-over-lightly, since all good humanists will rally to defend the fortress once the enemy is identified for what he is. This was the assumption underlying the Grubb and Lazerson attack on career education in the *Harvard Educational Review* (November 1975). The authors did not bother to undertake a serious examination of career education. It is so much more fun to criticize the straw man of neo-vocationalism. Besides, if it did not originate at Harvard, why bother? Seriously, there is more than a little good old-fashioned elitism displayed in the superficial pseudo-scholarship of the Grubb and Lazerson article, an elitism nonetheless dangerous (perhaps more so) for its espousal of egalitarian values.

The attacks from the liberal arts bastions which spring from misinformation or misrepresentations can be dealt with directly and effectively. Dr. Hoyt's forceful reply to Grubb and Lazerson should put a damper on that kind of nonsense (although nonsense out of Harvard does seem to have a leg up on horse sense from elsewhere). But there is another source of hostility to career education from liberal arts quarters which must be taken seriously, because over the long run it may prove to be a greater obstacle. It is hostility based on a *correct* reading of what career education is all about and is rooted in an idealogical antagonism to the values inherent in career education. It is fashionable today to understate the role of idealogy and explain away idealogical problems as misunderstandings, temporary impediments on the road to harmony. But if career education is really serious

about instituting basic reforms in educational institutions, we must admit that *someone* is going to be displaced or demoted, with power diminished and influence curtailed. We are not merely, or even primarily, talking about financial resources. In higher education, while money may be the glue holding the contraption together, *prestige* is the "coin of the realm." Career education threatens the prestige of many sacred cows.

To alter the metaphor, it whispers to incoming freshmen, "The King has no clothes." It will do no good to praise the liberal arts as a necessary part of any education and thus seek to avoid a head-on clash with these guardians of the sacred tablets. They insist on the right to determine the *order of value* of educational aims. Career education, by its very name, challenges the preeminence of the liberal arts. But the truth is awesome in its implications: The King has no clothes! Translated, this means simply that on all but a handful of campuses the liberal arts are dead or at least comatose in so far as a majority of students and faculty are concerned. What passes for the liberal arts today is but a hollow shell of the integrated body of knowledge which once held the allegiance and respect of educated persons. Career education does not threaten *liberal education*, because one can not threaten a corpse. Its remnants are found mostly in private, religiously-affiliated institutions. Career education *does* threaten the power, influence, and prestige of those "magicians cum computer" who have usurped the ancient, revered throne of liberal education and now use its mantle for their own purposes. Whether these purposes are legitimate or deserving of support is not being discussed here. What is evident on most campuses today is that what parades under the banner of liberal education is a hodge-podge of scientism and antiquarianism providing students with neither the foundations for enlightenment in the human soul nor the tools for self-determination in a dynamic economy.

"Work values," cry the guardians of virtue, "what neo-fascist nonsense! We all know our economic system is obsolete, that the problem is not to prepare for a role in it but to replace it with a more humane system based on human needs rather than profits!" So runs the litany of the new counter-culture critics. Rossi's insistence—which is also the message of 200 years of individual liberty and cultural freedom—that one's career is also "the world one creates" through a series of choices is a message last on the ears of those who will not listen. The career education philosophy assumes that American society is open and sufficiently adaptive to accommodate the immense range of ambitions, interests, and values advocated in the lecture halls and seminar rooms of our great universities. But there are legions of self-styled humanists who dispute this and who will make war on anyone who wants to teach students such things. Anyone who doubts this can spend a few days at Antioch, Harvard, Stanford, or any typical State university. Such idealogues, to be sure, are in a minority, a small one in most cases. Nevertheless, their influence is far greater than their numbers. Let us not underestimate their ability to erect obstacles to the progress of career education.

Opposition to career education also has come from the true humanists, the small band of mavericks who teach and advocate the traditional form of liberal education. Robert A. Goldwyn, the President's Special Consultant for Education, is such a man and his motives are honorable. But what such critics fail to acknowledge, or at least fail to give proper weight to, is that the traditional liberal arts curriculum was never intended for a mass market. It was a luxury afforded to aristocratic elite. I am speaking of a liberal education, not a smattering of humanities courses or art appreciation, nor the historicist approach to philosophy and culture which produces semi-educated fools who know the history of everything and the meaning of nothing. The partisans of liberal education, properly defined, want career considerations subordinated to the quest for Truth pure and simple. For most of us mortals, some compromise with necessity is inescapable. Career development must assume the guiding role.

There will always be a tension between the liberal arts and other educational strategies and social institutions, because it is the necessary and proper task of the liberal arts to ask questions and teach certain eternal values which are intrinsically appealing to the human soul, regardless of time and circumstance. But there is no reason why this existential tension need erupt into open warfare. The liberal arts—the liberating arts, if you will—can and must be integrated into the framework of career education starting in the middle grades. The crucial point is that neither dimension is a substitute for the other; both are necessary for the total education of the human being. What escapes the more fanatical partisans of liberal education is that it can take place within a framework of career education, whereas career education cannot be accommodated easily within the framework of the pure liberal arts.

These reflections will undoubtedly spark some disagreement; the issues have not been resolved even to my satisfaction. Yet since there is no escaping a confrontation with the liberal arts, we ought to take the offensive rather than await the next ambush. Contemporary liberal arts as practiced in most universities is vulnerable on many fronts and cannot afford a war of attrition

waged by the guerrilla bands of career education. They would do well to seek a peace treaty before their position further deteriorates.

* * *

If it assumed that some *modus vivendi* can be worked out with the proponents of liberal education, the prospect for expansion of career education efforts throughout our country appears much brighter. Yet other serious problems remain which I will turn to, speaking more directly from a business and industry standpoint.

From the American Institutes for Research national survey report it appears although some career education ideas have gained widespread currency across the nation, the actual measureable impact on students has been minimal to date. This is no reason to despair, given the brief history of career education as a reform movement. We have come a long way in six years. The national survey data are not entirely trustworthy, in my mind, because of the nature of the questionnaire, particularly those submitted to State and local education agencies. I find more value in the profiles of selected school districts. What permeates almost all of the data—and this was acknowledged in Dr. Hoyt's "next step" paper—is the lack of credible and useful evaluation of the various programs which fly under the career education banner. I agree with Dr. Hoyt's admonition that we must make use of traditional achievement measures to demonstrate the efficacy of career education efforts.

I am especially interested in the application of the National Assessment of Educational Progress's Career/Occupational Development (COD) tests as reported in the AIR survey. They state that "When the COD results become available, the National Assessment of Educational Progress should provide a new level of knowledge about the progress of career education toward the goals of preparing young people for productive and fulfilling careers." The use of these tests should assist State and local education agencies in evaluating various instructional strategies and materials. More "hard" proof of career education's efficacy is needed to move many State and local agencies from the posture of reluctant experimentors to that of enthusiastic advocates.

As is well known, a great deal of the parent, community, and business support for career education has come from the feeling of these groups that the movement will provide the motivational framework for improved student achievement levels, especially in the basic skill areas of reading, writing, and math. The decline in achievement scores is well documented and the fact that it has gone hand-in-hand with increased educational expenditures is a source of embarrassment and consternation in all quarters. In the ten-year period 1963-64 to 1973-74, per pupil expenditures in public schools (K to 12) increased from $845 to $1,364 *in constant dollars*, while test scores dropped steadily since 1969. This grim picture is alleviated somewhat by the rise in achievement scores in reading and math in the lower grades over the past few years. But parents and others are justified in their concern for better utilization of limited education dollars. Career education strategies can lead to more effective use of resources—human, physical, and financial—through an improvement in basic education. But this has not yet been demonstrated. Establishment of such proof will take time. As reported by Dr. Rita Bryant in a NACCE monograph, some data exist to support the relationship. However, a much better case needs to be made if we are to mobilize the energies of parent groups now involved in promotion of "Fundamental Schools" and various back-to-basics approaches. These people are natural and willing allies, but we will have to carry the banner to their ballpark.

One notable manifestation of the community-wide insistence on relevance and accountability in our schools is the Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education (RISE) Commission Report in California, the produce of State Superintendent Wilson Riles' efforts to conceptualize a new strategy for intermediate and secondary education. Some of the Commission's recommendations were incorporated into legislation recently passed by the Legislature (the Dunlap Bill) and subsequently vetoed by Governor Brown. The legislation sought to set up special advisory councils in participating schools to allow parents, teachers, and students to plan individualized instruction aimed especially at the slow learners, including activities outside the classroom. "School furloughs" for up to a year would be allowed for students to work on special projects in the community. Academic credit would be awarded for demonstrated performance in skill subjects rather than for classroom attendance alone.

All this is innovative and is probably worth trying, but with a $141 million price tag it is not entirely harmonious with the "infusion strategy" which is supposed to guide career education reform efforts. Of course, the Dunlap Bill, like the RISE report itself, was not presented as a career education bill although many of its concepts permeated the proposals.

I must confess a similar misgiving about the "process education" approach expoused by NACCE colleague, Dr. Larry Bailey, in his monograph recently published by Southern Illinois University *(Career and Vocational Education in the 1980s: Toward a Process Approach,* 1976). I will be very cautious in expressing my apprehensions because there is much in his essay which is

appealing. Nevertheless, the dichotomy between "skill objectives" and "content objectives" leaves me a little uneasy when he defines "skill objectives" so loosely as to remind me of the life adjustment approach of yesteryear. These "skill objectives" are aimed at developing healthy "life roles," which are of four kinds, with the "Work Role" being only one of four. It would be all too easy for the well-meaning teacher to give priority to, for example, the "Self-Improvement" or "Social Citizenship Role" while paying scant attention to developing skills appropriate to the "Work Role." The "Work Role" in his conception is not synonymous with the work values of Dr. Hoyt's system, and I fear it will be too quickly relegated to a subordinate place in the quest for the "Education Person." I much prefer to maintain the centrality of *Work* in the definition of career education (and admit there are realms of education beyond career education) than to so dilute it that the centrality is lost.

* * *

While business and industry participation in career education continues to grow, it is impossible to measure or classify it since there is no one clearinghouse for them. The National Association for Industry-Education Cooperation is expanding its affiliated network of councils and its liaison with other groups such as the National Alliance of Businessmen, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and Junior Achievement. It is true, as noted by the Business/Industry/Labor "Mini-Conference" sponsored by the U.S. Office of Career Education, that many of these national efforts and commitments have yet to filter down to local communities. It is also true, however, that business, industry, and labor in local communities have not waited for leadership from national associations but have gone ahead with their own programs. A look into any metropolitan community will find business involved in advisory committees and in all kinds of cooperative work programs. The interest and the commitment from business is definitely on the rise, at least for the more practical, jobs-oriented programs. Broad participation in career awareness activities at the elementary school level is not as well developed, but there are opportunities for teachers and administrators who will seek them.

The constituency represented by the National Federation of Independent Business is America's small business enterprises, the nine million units you never hear about on the TV evening news. Because they are small and very independent-minded, they are not easily mobilized into service for career education or other civic projects. They do most of those activities entirely spontaneously as a result of local stimulus and personal experiences with their children, neighbors, and schools. They are a tremendous reservoir of potential manpower and expertise which could play a large role in career awareness and career exploration programs. They are proportionately more labor-intensive and more people-oriented than larger firms. For these reasons have an even greater stake in career education.

Too often the student's image of America's private business sector is that of the giant corporation with twenty levels of bureaucracy and no face-to-face contact with top management. In small businesses it is quite the opposite. The variety of careers in small enterprises is more numerous than in the corporate sector. By Small Business Administration estimates, over 300,000 new businesses are launched each year in this country. It would be difficult to classify some of them according to any system of occupational clusters. If students were more aware of the tremendous career diversity in this realm and more aware of the associated challenges and rewards, we would not find two-thirds of junior high schools students preferring careers in non-profit institutions, teaching, government, politics, and the like. I have never understood why these careers would be considered more "idealistic" than that of an entrepreneur who provides needed goods or services in the market economy. Career education should go a long way toward breaking down the persisting stereotypes in the minds of too many teachers and, hence, students.

The direct involvement of the National Federation of Independent Business in career education has pivoted on the Institute for Public Affairs Research Community Participation Model developed by the IPAR in Portland, Oregon. This "IPARticipate" model has developed proven methods for (1) inventorying community resources in the business, labor, government, professions, and volunteer areas, (2) recruiting a cross section of these resources, (3) scheduling them for school-community interaction through a central clearinghouse, and (4) evaluating the activities through both teacher and volunteer feedback. The program is supported almost entirely by private sector funds, which makes it unique among such community resource programs. What makes it so attractive to the NFIB is the efficiency with which it performs these tasks and the ability to involve a large number of firms rather than depend on the generosity of a few large companies and public utilities.

There are similar community resource banks in Orange County, California and elsewhere but, as far as I can determine, they are mostly school-based and school financed rather than community-based and funded. If the community wants to be a partner in career education, these programs should be community-based rather than school-based. This is a necessary counter-weight to

the power and control already exercised from within the school system. Schools need this counter-weight as well, in addition to the independent perspective provided by community organizations.

We will know that career education has suceeded in foregoing the business/labor/community partnership when these activities become institutionalized in programs like the Institute for Public Affairs Research model. Ad hoc arrangements are useful in getting something off the ground since they allow for flexibility and experimentation. However, the need over the next few years will be for a consolidation of business, industry, and labor activities into efficient and effective institutional systems.

While in most cases the place to begin in forging such community-wide institutions is at the metropolitan level, in some states the key might be to start with a State-wide coalition. The State Chamber of Commerce, Industry-Education Councils, Rotary, Kiwanis, and other service groups all must cooperate in improving and expanding the delivery vehicles for the participation of business firms of all sizes and characteristics. I am hopeful that the Commissioner's National Conference on Career Education in November 1976, will provide the occasion for the development of working partnerships among these many associations. Certainly there is much to be learned from closer collaboration. The National Federation of Independent Business is eager to play an active role in the development of new partnerships and will do everything possible to stimulate and facilitate the involvement of the small business entrepreneurs. Their involvement will enrich not only the education of youth but the lives and careers of businessmen and businesswomen themselves.

GPO 214-283